

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY  
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

**WRIT PETITION NO. 6926 OF 2004.**

Mrs.Vastavikta Kiran Goragandhi.... Petitioner.

V/s.

Shri Kiran B. Goragandhi. ... Respondent.

None for the petitioner.

R.T.Parekh for the respondent.

**CORAM: V.C.DAGA, J.**

**DATED: 1st September 2006.**

**P.C.:**

. None for the petitioner.

. Perused petition.

2. This petition appears to have been filed somewhere in the month of August, 2004. Since then the petition is pending for admission. The previous order-sheets go to show that when the matter was placed for admission the same was required to be adjourned for one or the other reason. The objections were not removed by the petitioner for a considerable long time. On more than two occasions the petition was adjourned at the request of the petitioner herself.

3. Today, nobody is present on behalf of the petitioner. Dismissal of this petition in default serves no purpose. It results in multiplicity of the proceedings leading to restoration of the substantive petition. Hence, with the assistance of learned counsel for the respondent, I went through the impugned order in general and para-6 thereof in particular and also perused contentions raised in the petition.

4. Having seen the challenges set up in the petition against the impugned order and the material placed on record, I am of the considered opinion that the view taken by the Court below is a reasonable and possible view. The view taken can be supported on the basis of the material available on record. No interference with the impugned order is, thus, called for.

5. In the result, petition is dismissed in limine with no order as to costs.

**(V.C.DAGA, J.)**